

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

8 STEPHEN R. KERN,)
9 Plaintiff(s),) Case No. 2:13-cv-00855-RFB-NJK
10)
11 vs.) ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
12 CLARK COUNTY SHERIFF, et al.,) STATUS CHECK AND
13 Defendant(s).) MOTION FOR DISCOVERY
14) (Docket Nos. 23, 24)
15

16 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for a status check, filed on March 12, 2015.
17 Docket No. 23. Also pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for discovery, filed on March
18 20, 2015. Docket No. 24. The Court finds that these motions are properly resolved without oral
argument. *See* Local Rule 78-2.

19 **I. Motion for Status Check**

20 On August 12, 2013, the Court granted Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.
21 Docket No. 9. The Court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint for failure to state a claim and granted
22 Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint. *Id.* Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint on October
23 11, 2013. Docket No. 14.

24 On May 5, 2014, the Court issued a Screening Order on Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.
25 Docket No. 16. The Court ordered that the Amended Complaint shall proceed on Counts I and II
26 against Defendants Martinez and Rogers. *Id.*, at 7. The Court further ordered that, within 30 days,
27 Plaintiff had to furnish the U.S. Marshal the required USM-285 form with relevant information as
28 to each defendant on each form. *Id.* Additionally, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file a notice with

1 the Court within 20 days after receiving from the U.S. Marshal a copy of the USM-285 forms,
 2 identifying which defendants were served and which were not served. *Id.*

3 On March 12, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for status check, indicating that Plaintiff “was
 4 unsuccessful in sending summons to each defendant.” Docket No. 23. Plaintiff did not attach the
 5 USM-285 forms to his motion for a status check. *See* Docket. Thus, it is unclear whether the U.S.
 6 Marshal attempted to serve Defendants Martinez and Rogers.

7 The Court **ORDERS** the U.S. Marshal to file a notice of the status of service in this case, no
 8 later than March 26, 2015. The Court further **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file a notice of the status of
 9 service in this case, no later than April 6, 2015. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for a status check
 10 (Docket No. 23) is hereby **DENIED**.

11 **II. Motion for Discovery**

12 On March 20, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for discovery. Docket No. 24. Plaintiff’s motion
 13 is premature, as it remain unclear whether any Defendants have even been served, and Court has not
 14 yet entered a scheduling order regarding discovery. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for discovery
 15 is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.

16 **III. Conclusion**

17 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 18 1. Plaintiff’s motion for a status check (Docket No. 23) is **DENIED**.
- 19 2. Plaintiff’s motion for discovery (Docket No. 24) is **DENIED** without prejudice.
- 20 3. The U.S. Marshal is **ORDERED** to file a notice of the status of service in this case, no
 21 later than March 26, 2015.
- 22 4. Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to file a notice of the status of service in this case, no later than
 23 April 6, 2015.

24 DATED: March 23, 2015

25
 26
 27 
 28

NANCY J. KORPE
United States Magistrate Judge